
Site Address:	33 Crystal Way, Waterloo, PO7 8NB		
Proposal:	Two storey and single storey side extension, with timber cladding.		
Application No:	APP/20/00730	Expiry Date:	09/11/2020
Applicant:	Mr McDuff		
Agent:	Mr Watford	Case Officer:	Bee Crawford
	Hop Architects Ltd		
Ward:	Waterloo		

Recommendation: **REFUSE PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

- 1.1 The application site is a modern two storey end of terraced property situated on an irregular shaped plot and has a brown tiled pitched roof and elevations of red multibrick with white painted render at first floor. The site is level with no current vehicular access at the front, which is mainly laid to lawn with hedging and shrubs to the boundary. The rear garden has a patio area, grass and shrubs and is enclosed by fencing to all boundaries.
- 1.2 The adjoining two storey terraced property is to the north, modern two storey terraced properties are opposite, a parking court and the side aspect of two storey semi-detached properties beyond are to the south and an area of woodland lies between the rear of the property and Tempest Avenue. The area is a modern estate of medium density with a mixture of two storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties of similar age, and similar and individual style and design.

2 Planning History

03/69030/000 - Single storey side extension. REF, 16/12/2003
APP/19/01194 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 3.6 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.3 metres and a maximum height of 3.6 metres. WD, 06/01/2020
APP/20/00012 - Prior notification for single storey development extending 3.60 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, incorporating an eaves height of 2.30 metres and a maximum height of 3.60 metres. WD, 17/02/2020
APP/20/00127 - Single storey rear extension. PERM, 28/05/2020

3 Proposal

- 3.1 The proposal is for the construction of a two storey and single storey side extension with timber cladding, following the removal of the existing conservatory.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16 (High Quality Design)
CS17 (Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS19 (Effective Provision of Infrastructure)
CS20 (Transport and Access Strategy)
DM13 (Car and Cycle Parking on Residential Development)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2 (Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Havant Borough Pre Submission Local Plan 2036

E1* (High quality design)

Emsworth Neighbourhood Plan Post Examination Version 2020

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

None.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 8

Number of site notices: Not applicable.

Statutory advertisement: Not applicable.

Number of representations received: 1

Comment	Officer Comment
Whilst I don't object to the extension in principle I am objecting to the external finishes of the extension. The wood cladding is not in keeping with the local area and would be out of place on the street scene. If this planning was to be approved with these finishes it would set a precedent across the rest of the estate. I also think there is an error in the application form as it states trees and hedges will not need pruning or removing for the works to take place. I believe this is not true and pruning will be required to existing hedge lines.	See section 7. Noted.

7 **Planning Considerations**

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area
- (iii) Effect on neighbouring properties
- (iv) Parking

(i) Principle of development

7.2 The application site is located within the defined urban area, therefore development is considered acceptable in principle subject to development management criteria.

(ii) Appropriateness of design and impact on the character of the area

7.3 The proposal is for a substantial addition which includes a two storey and single storey side extension. The two storey element has a depth of 8.65 metres, matching that of the existing property and a width of 4.3 metres, with a pitched and hipped roof to an eaves height of 4.9 metres and a ridge height of 7.4 metres.

7.4 The single storey side extension is set back 2.75 metres from the front of the property with a depth of 5.9 metres, a width of 1.75 metres with a flat roof to a maximum height of 3 metres. The proposal would provide generous additional accommodation including a substantial kitchen/diner, two double bedrooms and an en-suite shower room. The property would virtually double in size and be tantamount to an additional dwelling. The scheme also includes the provision of timber cladding to the new extension and existing rear elevation.

- 7.5 The site is located on a bend in the road and is highly visible in the street scene, with the existing property set at an angle. The extension would be a continuation of the current front elevation with the southern corners of both the two storey and single storey elements abutting the front boundary onto Crystal Way. It is considered that the proposed extension would be an overly prominent and jarring form of development, resulting in an incongruous feature in the street scene at variance with the existing building line and otherwise open spacious character of the immediate area.
- 7.6 Regarding the proposed timber cladding, whilst it is acknowledged this a contemporary finish there are no other examples in the surrounding area and the properties in the immediate vicinity are finished in more traditional materials, maintaining a degree of uniformity. It is considered the proposed cladding would result in a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area and does not comply with Policy CS16 of the HBLP (Core Strategy).
- 7.7 Consequently it is considered that an extension of this scale would appear overbearing, incongruous and have a significant impact on the existing spatial setting and visual amenity of the area. It would eliminate the sense of openness on the bend of Crystal Way with the proposed extension abutting the boundary with the highway. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011.

(iii) Effect on neighbouring properties

Impact on 35 Crystal Way - side/north

- 7.8 This property is a two storey terraced property which adjoins the application site. The proposed extension would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of number 33 and would be approximately 4.5 metres from the boundary with this property. Although there is a new first floor window in the rear elevation of the extension, it is judged that this would not result in any unacceptable additional overlooking to the rear amenity area of this property.

Impact on 31 Crystal Way - rear and side/west

- 7.9 Due to the location of this property, the rear elevation of the proposal would face the side elevation and garden of number 31 Crystal Way. The extension would be 14 metres from the boundary with this property with the side elevation a further minimum of 6 metres away. Whilst there could be the perception of additional overlooking to the garden of this property it would be to the side area behind the garage and a degree of overlooking already exists from the current first floor windows in the present rear elevation. It is therefore judged any resulting impact would not be unacceptable.

Impact on 30, 32, 34, 40 and 42 Crystal Way - opposite/south and east

- 7.10 These properties are situated opposite the site, with the front elevation of the closest property at number 32 Crystal Way 17 metres away and the furthest at 22 metres away. Whilst the proposal would be highly visible from the front elevations of these properties, they are considered to be a sufficient distance away for any impact to be limited and acceptable.

(iv) Parking

- 7.11 There is an increase in the number of bedrooms from two to four, subsequently there will be a requirement for three on site parking spaces as recommended in the HBC Parking SPD (July 2016). There is currently no parking on site and the block plan only indicates the provision of one parking space to serve the property.
- 7.12 The agent advised the area is not particularly busy, enabling residents to park on the roadside if required, however a parking survey has not been carried out and submitted to verify this. Notwithstanding this, there are no parking restrictions on the road which is not a main thoroughfare, and a high proportion of the surrounding properties have private drives. Furthermore, there are several parking courts within the immediate area. Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged the proposal would result in a deficit of two on site parking spaces it is considered this would not be a defensible reason for refusal.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1 It is considered the proposed two storey and single storey side extension would appear overbearing, incongruous and have a significant impact on the existing spatial setting and visual amenity of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy CS16 of the Core Strategy 2011 and the adopted Design Guide 2011 and is therefore recommended for refusal.

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **REFUSE PERMISSION** for application APP/20/00730 for the following reasons

- 1 The proposed extension would by reason of its size, scale and prominent siting be harmful to the existing character and appearance of the area conflicting with the established pattern of development and spatial characteristics and setting of the street scene. The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011, the Havant Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.